4.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section evaluates the potential for significant impacts to occur due to the proposed project. Consistent with the discussion in Section 4.0 (Introduction to the Analysis), based on a preliminary environmental analysis of the proposed project prepared prior to commencement of this EIR and analysis completed for the BECSP Program EIR, substantial additional analysis of hazards and hazardous materials impacts is not required. Rather, this section includes a discussion of the current environmental setting, the proposed project and its relationship to the BECSP, where applicable; a discussion of consistency with the environmental analysis prepared for the BECSP, where applicable; any new information or analysis pertinent to the current analysis and identification of impacts; identification of mitigation measures required to address potential impacts of the proposed project; and significance conclusions regarding the proposed project after mitigation incorporation. Mitigation measures included applicable measures from the BECSP EIR as well as any new or additional mitigation measures required to reduce potential impacts. All impacts are considered to be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

Data used to prepare this section were obtained from the BECSP EIR, City of Huntington Beach General Plan, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report (Phase I) (Appendix B1), Phase II Investigation Report (Appendix B2), and Additional Site Assessment Report and Work Plan for Additional Site Assessment (Appendix B3). Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials are provided in Section 4.6.4 (References) at the end of this section.

4.6.1 Environmental Setting

The proposed project site is currently developed with retail, office, and restaurant uses in the Town and Country Plaza, a stand-alone restaurant, and a gas station.

Potential On-Site Hazardous Materials

According to a Phase I report conducted by SCS Engineers (SCS) in January 2007, the gas station and a dry cleaning facility were identified to be of potential environmental concern for the proposed project site. The gas station is a typical service station with three auto service bays. Underground storage tanks (USTs) for fuel and waste oil, aboveground propane tanks, automotive parts cleaners, and a supply of small containers of automotive fluids for brakes, transmissions, as well as radiators for retail and auto services uses were on site. Staining of the concrete slab in the service bays typical of auto service operations was observed during site reconnaissance; however, there was no obvious indication of spills or leaks to subsurface soils.

The gas station was first assessed in 1995 and petroleum hydrocarbons were identified in the soil. Groundwater monitoring wells were first installed in 1997 and additional wells have been added since then. Free fuel product was identified in one of these wells adjacent to the fuel USTs (MW-9). In 2000 Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE) was detected in soil samples collected adjacent to the USTs. In 2001, a vapor extraction test was performed and deemed as an acceptable method for remediation. This vapor extraction system operated and shut down in November 2004. The 2007 first quarter groundwater

monitoring report indicated that a total of 22,528 pounds of vapor phase hydrocarbons had been removed to that date. In addition, groundwater pumping was conducted from March to December 2004 removing approximately 183,829 gallons of groundwater and 0.23 gallon of dissolved phase hydrocarbons.[17]

The Phase I stated that the active gas station is a Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) site with on-going remediation of soil and quarterly groundwater monitoring under the oversight of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) and Orange County Health Care Agency (OCHCA). The environmental work is conducted by Wayne Perry Construction, with Equilon Enterprises (dba Shell Oil Products) accepting responsibility and funding the work. Given the on-going environmental work by Perry Construction and regulatory oversight from SARWQCB and OCHCA, no additional investigation was recommended during the Phase I process. Various work plans have been submitted to and were approved by OCHCA to remediate any existing conditions. These work plans include an Additional Site Assessment to address potential soil and groundwater contamination (report dated July 16, 2010; approval date August 20, 2010),[18,19] separate phase hydrocarbon removal (November 29, 2010, approval dated January 11, 2011),[20,21] soil vapor survey (report dated November 30, 2010, approval date January 12, 2011),[22,23] and the installation of a "deep zone" groundwater monitoring well (December 15, 2010, approval dated January 13, 2011).[24,25] Remediation efforts remain active at the project site and will be ongoing with implementation of the proposed project.

The dry cleaning facility located at 18510 Beach Boulevard has a dry cleaning machine on premises and two 55-gallon steel drums containing waste cleaning fluid and used filters in secondary containment. On the floor, adjacent to the drum containment, two approximately 5-gallon plastic containers of perchloroethene (PCE, dry cleaning fluid) and two 1-gallon containers of petroleum distillate-based cleaning fluid were found. A floor drain and surrounding floor in the rear of the cleaners were significantly stained with rust, most likely from the adjacent boiler. The dry cleaning facility operations have used PCE on site since at least 1981.[26] No previous investigations have been conducted on this

---

[17] SCS Engineers, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Shell Station and Town Country Plaza, 18502 and 18510 to 18552 Beach Boulevard, Huntington Beach, CA 92648* (January 22, 2007).
[18] Wayne Perry, Inc., *Additional Site Assessment Report and Work Plan for Additional Site Assessment, Shell Service Station, 18502 Beach Boulevard (at Ellis Avenue), Huntington Beach, California* (July 16, 2010).
[19] County of Orange Health Care Agency, Public Health Services Environmental Health, *Approval Letter for Additional Site Assessment Report Work Plan for Additional Site Assessment dated July 16, 2010* (August 20, 2010).
[20] Wayne Perry, Inc., *Work Plan for SPH Removal-MW-11, Shell-Branded Service Station, 18502 Beach Boulevard (at Ellis Avenue), Huntington Beach, California* (November 29, 2010).
[21] County of Orange Health Care Agency, Public Health Services Environmental Health, *Approval Letter for Work Plan for SPH removal- MW-11 dated November 29, 2010* (January 11, 2011).
[22] Wayne Perry, Inc., *Revised Work Plan for Soil Vapor Survey, Shell Service Station, 18502 Beach Boulevard (at Ellis Avenue), Huntington Beach, California* (November 30, 2010).
[23] County of Orange Health Care Agency, Public Health Services Environmental Health, *Approval Letter for Revised Work Plan for Soil Vapor Survey dated November 30, 2010* (January 12, 2011).
[24] Wayne Perry, Inc., *Work Plan for Additional Site Assessment, Shell Service Station, 18502 Beach Boulevard (at Ellis Avenue), Huntington Beach, California* (December 15, 2010).
[25] County of Orange Health Care Agency, Public Health Services Environmental Health, *Approval Letter for Work Plan for Additional Site Assessment dated December 15, 2010* (January 13, 2011).
[26] SCS Engineers, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Shell Station and Town Country Plaza, 18502 and 18510 to 18552 Beach Boulevard, Huntington Beach, CA 92648* (January 22, 2007).

facility. Further investigation of the dry cleaning facility was recommended by the Phase I to assess the potential for contamination.

In February 2008, SCS conducted a Phase II investigation that included collection and analysis of soil gas and soil samples from the dry cleaner. The Phase II determined that PCE was detected in all of the analyzed soil gas samples at concentrations ranging from 0.186 to 251 μg/l, which is above the residential California Human Heal Screening Level (CHHSL) of 0.180 μg/l, and in most cases above the industrial CHHSL of 0.603 μg/l. PCE was detected at the highest concentration near the northeastern corner of the building where the dry cleaning machines are located and the PCE concentrations were lower in surrounding areas.[27] Trichloroethylene (TCE) were detected in two soil gas samples at concentration up to 2.04 μg/l, which exceeds the residential and industrial CHHSL of 0.528 and 1.77 μg/l, respectively.[28] TCE can be a contaminant in PCE solvent or it can be derived from degradation of PCE. The Phase II concluded that the PCE in soil gas beneath the dry cleaning facility would be of concern to OCHCA and recommended that any further investigation and/or remediation activities be conducted under the oversight of a regulatory agency.

In early 2010, the dry cleaning equipment and source of PCE was removed from the dry cleaning facility site. The vapor extraction system was operated until two successive sampling events indicated no detectable PCE in the extracted vapor. Rebound testing had indicated no significant rebound in PCE soil vapor concentrations. The operation of the vapor extraction system has successfully remediated PCE to below detectable concentration in the extracted vapor. Confirmation samples of soil, soil vapor, and groundwater have not identified any significant concentrations of PCE above commercial health risk-based levels.[29] A no further action certification was issue by OCHCA on October 14, 2010, for the dry cleaner facility.

The Phase I also reported three potential concerns within 0.25-mile radius of the proposed project site. The Chevron Station located at 18501 Beach Boulevard had a leaking underground storage tank (LUST) case that was reported to be closed in 1984. In addition, a gasoline release that impacted soil and groundwater was reported at this site in 1994. Remedial action is reported to be underway currently. Mark C Bloome Tire located at 18455 Beach Boulevard had a waste oil release discovered at the site during tank closure and the case was reported closed in 1987. Metro Car Wash located at 18400 Beach Boulevard had a gasoline release that impacted the soil and groundwater in 1997. Remediation was conducted in 2001, groundwater monitoring was conducted in 2004, and the case was reported closed in 2006. No other sites within 0.25 mile are known to have contamination and are not anticipated to have impacted the proposed project site. Similarly, no other sites located beyond 0.25 mile were anticipated to have historically impacted the proposed project site.[30]

---

[27] SCS Engineers, *Phase II Investigation Report, Ellis Cleaners, 18510 Beach Boulevard, Huntington Beach, CA 92648* (February 2, 2008).
[28] SCS Engineers, *Phase II Investigation Report, Ellis Cleaners, 18510 Beach Boulevard, Huntington Beach, CA 92648* (February 2, 2008).
[29] SCS Engineers, "No Further Action" Letter, Ellis Cleaners, 18510 Beach Boulevard, Huntington Beach (OCHCA Case 08IC012) (July 16, 2010).
[30] SCS Engineers, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Shell Station and Town Country Plaza, 18502 and 18510 to 18552 Beach Boulevard, Huntington Beach, CA 92648* (January 22, 2007), pp. 13–14.

Asbestos

Asbestos, a naturally occurring fibrous material, was used in many building materials for fireproofing and insulating properties before many of its most common construction-related uses were banned by the EPA between the early 1970s and 1991 under the authority of the California Clean Air Act (CCAA) and the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). Loose insulation, ceiling panels, and brittle plaster are potential sources of friable (easily crumbled) asbestos. Since inhalation of airborne asbestos fibers is the primary mode of asbestos entry into the body, friable asbestos presents the greatest health threat. Asbestos-related health problems include lung cancer and asbestosis. Nonfriable asbestos is generally bound to other materials such that it does not become airborne under normal conditions. Any activity that involves cutting, grinding, or drilling during demolition (especially demolition of older, pre-1980 structures), or relocation of underground utilities, could result in the release of friable asbestos fibers unless proper precautions are taken. According to the Phase I, building permits indicate that buildings on the proposed project site were constructed in 1965. Consequently, since buildings on the proposed project site were built prior to the ban on asbestos, asbestos containing materials (ACMs) could be present in a variety of building materials at the site (e.g., in roofing felt, vinyl flooring, dry wall mud, transite sheet or pipe, etc.), and abatement will be required during the project's demolition phase.

Lead

Lead is a naturally occurring metallic element. Among its numerous uses and sources, lead can be found in paint, water pipes, solder in plumbing systems, and in soils around buildings and structures painted with lead-based paint. In 1978, the federal government required the reduction of lead in house paint to less than 0.06 percent (600 parts per million). Because of its toxic properties, lead is regulated as a hazardous material. Excessive exposure to lead can result in the accumulation of lead in the blood, soft tissues, and bones. Children are particularly susceptible to potential lead-related health problems because it is easily absorbed into developing systems and organs. Inspection, testing, and removal (abatement) of lead-containing building materials must be performed by state-certified contractors who are required to comply with applicable health and safety and hazardous materials regulations. Buildings that have been constructed prior to 1978 and that contain lead-based paints could require abatement prior to construction activities for the proposed project. Since the buildings on the proposed project site were constructed in 1965, it is likely that lead-based paint was used and that abatement will be required during the project's demolition phase.

Methane Gas

The proposed project site is located within a methane overlay district designated by the City. As such, methane gas, commonly known as natural gas, may underlay the site. Potential hazards associated with methane include fire or explosion due to methane gas accumulations, since it is a highly flammable substance, and human health risks associated with natural gas poisoning. It should also be noted that petrogenic sources are not the sole source of methane gas and that biogenic sources, such as peat, are also capable of methane gas production. Peat and organic soil occurrences are estimated to be quite widespread in the City in former marshes and closed depressions where quiet water and vegetation were abundant. The project site is identified on Figure EH-13 (Peat and Organic Soils) of the City's General

Plan Hazards Element as probable location of peat; however, the area and depth of peat is unknown. The Huntington Beach Fire Department (HBFD) would require the Applicant to test for the presence of methane gas to determine if a problem exists and to rule methane out as a potential concern. A methane sample plan would be submitted to the HBFD for review and approval, prior to the commencement of sampling. In the event that methane gas is discovered, appropriate measures to reduce the potential impacts of methane gas to future occupants and visitors of the project site would be required as per City Specification No. 429 (Methane District Building Permit Requirements). Identification of these measures would be required prior to plan approval.

4.6.2 Regulatory Framework

Refer to Section 4.6.2 (Regulatory Framework) of the BECSP Program EIR, for applicable federal, state, and local regulations that would apply to the proposed project. No new regulations have been implemented since the certification of the Program EIR.

The BECSP Development Code, which includes development standards, development regulations, and guidelines, governs all development actions with the BECSP area, including the proposed project site. The proposed project would be subject to development standards specific to the proposed project site's BECSP designations of Town Center Neighborhood, included as BECSP Section 2.1.4 (Town Center Neighborhood).

General Plan and BECSP Consistency Analysis

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the use, storage, or transport of large quantities of hazardous materials. Any commonly used hazardous materials would be used and stored in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations, as required by General Plan Policy HM 1.1.4. Demolition of existing structures is unlikely to result in a release of hazardous materials provided that all applicable regulations regarding removal of ACMs and lead-based paint are followed. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to include the use of hazardous materials or the generation of substantial quantities of hazardous waste, and would not create an unsafe or hazardous condition for adjacent uses, consistent with General Plan Policy HM 1.2.3, which calls for development within close proximity of sensitive uses to not utilize, store, handle hazardous waste or materials. Hazardous materials associated with the proposed project would consist mostly of typical household-type cleaning products and maintenance products (e.g., paints, solvents, cleaning products). However, the proposed project would be required to comply with federal and State laws to eliminate or reduce the consequence of hazardous materials accidents, as required by General Plan Policy HM 1.1.4. The proposed project would not conflict with the applicable goals and policies of the City of Huntington Beach General Plan Hazardous Materials Element and other applicable regulations.

The proposed project site is located within a Methane Overlay District. As required by General Plan Policy EH 3.2.2 and Policy EH 3.3.1, the City has set minimum requirements for new building construction within methane overlay districts in order to reduce the hazards presented from accumulation of methane gas by requiring the appropriate testing and mitigation measures for all new buildings within the methane districts. In addition, the project site is identified in Figure EH 13 of the City's General Plan Hazards Element as a probable location of peat; however the area and depth of peat

is unknown. Hazards associated with the subsidence or collapse of such organic soils would be avoided through the use of appropriate foundational supports (refer to Section 4.5 [Geology/Soils]). Future development under the proposed project would be required to comply with the City of Huntington Beach grading and building codes to ensure that methane and peat hazards are evaluated by standard testing methods and appropriate engineering and reduction methods are applied to reduce potential hazards. The proposed project would not conflict with the applicable goals and policies of the City of Huntington Beach General Plan Environmental Hazards Element and other applicable regulations.

4.6.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

The analysis in this section focuses on the potential for construction and operation of the proposed project to result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment. In determining the level of significance, the analysis assumes that construction and operation of the proposed project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. This section provides a discussion of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials based on Appendix G of the 2011 CEQA Guidelines thresholds of significance, as follows:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials
- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school
- Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment
- If located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area
- If within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands

Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials

Exposure of the public or the environment to hazardous materials could occur in the following manner as a result of the proposed project: improper handling or use of hazardous materials or hazardous wastes particularly by untrained personnel; transportation accident; environmentally unsound disposal methods; or fire, explosion or other emergencies. The severity of potential effects varies with the activity conducted, the concentration and type of hazardous material or wastes present, and the proximity of sensitive receptors. The types and amounts of hazardous materials would vary according to the nature of

the activity at the project site. Hazardous materials regulations were established at the state level to ensure compliance with federal regulations intended to reduce the risk to human health and the environment from the routine use of hazardous substances.

To ensure that workers and others at the project site are not exposed to unacceptable levels of risk associated with the use and handling of hazardous materials, employers and businesses are required to implement existing hazardous materials regulations, with compliance monitored by state (e.g., OSHA in the workplace or DTSC for hazardous waste) and local jurisdictions (e.g., the HBFD). Adherence to existing hazardous materials regulations would ensure compliance with existing safety standards related to the handling, use and storage of hazardous materials, and compliance with the safety procedures mandated by applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations (Resource Conservation Recovery Act [RCRA], California Hazardous Waste Control Law, and principles prescribed by the California Department of Health Services [DHS], Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and National Institutes of Health).

The proposed project includes residential and commercial uses, and does not include a component that would traditionally introduce hazards or hazardous materials to the project site. Hazardous materials associated with the occupancy of the residential component of the proposed project would include typical household cleaning products as well as typical maintenance supplies. Hazardous materials associated with operation of the proposed retail uses of the proposed project could include typical maintenance products as well as maintenance products for upkeep of the grounds and landscape formulated with hazardous substances, including fuels, cleaners and degreasers, solvents, paints, lubricants, adhesives, sealers, and pesticides/herbicides. The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Office of Hazardous Materials Safety prescribes strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials, as described in Titles 40, 42, 45, and 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), and implemented by Titles 17, 19, and 27 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). The transportation of hazardous materials can result in accidental spills, leaks, toxic releases, fire, or explosion. Adherence to these regulations, which requires compliance with all applicable federal and state laws related to the transportation of hazardous materials, would reduce the likelihood and severity of accidents that might occur during transit.

Operation of the proposed project would not require the handling of hazardous or other materials that would result in the production of large amounts of hazardous waste. The construction phase of the proposed project may generate hazardous and/or toxic waste. Federal, state, and local regulations govern the disposal of wastes identified as hazardous which could be produced in the course of demolition and construction. Asbestos, lead, or other hazardous materials encountered during demolition or construction activities would be disposed of in compliance with all applicable regulations for the handling of such waste. Should the use and/or storage of hazardous materials at the project site rise to a level subject to regulation, those uses would be required to comply with federal and state laws to eliminate or reduce the consequence of hazardous material accidents resulting from routine use, disposal and storage of hazardous materials on the project site during both the construction and operation phases of the project to a ***less than significant*** level.

Reasonably Foreseeable Upset and Accident Conditions

Demolition, grading and limited excavation activities for development of the proposed project could result in the exposure of construction personnel and the public to hazardous substances in the soil. Exposure to hazardous substances could occur from soil contamination caused by historic uses (gas station and dry cleaner) on the site, migrating contaminants originating at nearby listed sites, or from construction-related soil contamination caused by spillage and/or mixing of construction trash and debris into the soil. If any unidentified sources of contamination are encountered during demolition, grading, or excavation, the removal activities required could pose health and safety risks capable of resulting in various short-term or long-term adverse health effects in exposed persons. In order to address the potential for encountering contamination within the project area, a Phase I ESA report and a Phase II Investigation report were prepared for the project site, as required by mitigation measures BECSP MM4.6-1 to investigate potential contamination and require remediation if necessary, prior to issuance of any occupancy permits. As discussed above, the Phase I revealed that the active gas station is a LUST site with ongoing remediation of soil and quarterly groundwater monitoring under the oversight of the SARWQCB and OCHCA. To remediate any existing conditions at the project site various work plans have been submitted to and were approved by OCHCA. These work plans include an Additional Site Assessment to address potential soil and groundwater contamination, separate phase hydrocarbon removal, soil vapor survey, and the installation of a "deep zone" groundwater monitoring well. Remediation efforts would continue with implementation of the proposed project for an indeterminate time. As part of the proposed project, existing monitoring equipment that is currently located outside will be relocated within the proposed parking garage to allow for testing and treatment of the aquifer.[31] Identification and remediation of known contamination on the project site as required by mitigation measure BECSP MM4.7-1, in combination with implementation of mitigation measure BECSP MM4.6-2, which requires the preparation and implementation of a Risk Management Plan in the event that unknown or unidentified soil and/or groundwater is encountered would minimize the potential risk of contamination created by implementation of the proposed project.

Demolition of existing structures could result in exposure of construction personnel and the public to hazardous substances such as asbestos or lead-based paints. Federal and state regulations govern the renovation and demolition of structures where materials containing lead and asbestos are present. These requirements include: South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rules and Regulations pertaining to asbestos abatement (including Rule 1403); Construction Safety Orders 1529 (pertaining to asbestos) and 1532.1 (pertaining to lead) from Title 8 of the CCR; Part 61, Subpart M, of the CFR (pertaining to asbestos); and lead exposure guidelines provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Asbestos and lead abatement must be performed and monitored by contractors with appropriate certifications from the state Department of Health Services. In addition, California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal-OSHA) has regulations concerning the use of hazardous materials, including requirements for safety training, availability of safety equipment, hazardous materials exposure warnings, and emergency action and fire prevention plan preparation.

[31] Mark E. Faulkner, Email to Rosemary Medel, Associate Planner, City of Huntington Beach, from Land Development Services LLC, regarding environmental monitoring equipment (September 2, 2011).

While it is anticipated that operation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, this operational analysis presents the potential possibilities of such a risk. Development of the proposed project would include the use of and storage of common hazardous materials such as paints, solvents, and cleaning products. Additionally, grounds and landscape maintenance could also use a variety of products formulated with hazardous materials, including fuels, cleaners, lubricants, adhesives, sealers, and pesticides/herbicides. The properties and health effects of different chemicals are unique to each chemical and depend on the extent to which an individual is exposed. The extent and exposure of individuals to hazardous materials would be limited by the relatively small quantities of these materials that would be stored and used on the project site. As common maintenance products and chemicals would be used in conformance with warning labels and storage recommendations from the individual manufacturers, these hazardous materials would not pose any greater risk than at any other similar development. Through development of the proposed project, hazardous materials could be stored within the project site, but the materials would generally be in the form of routinely used common chemicals. Further, as described above, ongoing remediation efforts at the project site would continue with implementation of the proposed project.[32] Accordingly, groundwater contamination that could potentially occur with operation of the proposed project, but would not be likely, could be detected through groundwater monitoring. Therefore, the probability of a major hazardous materials incident would be remote, and this impact would be less than significant.

The proposed project site is located within a Methane Overlay District and is therefore subject to mitigation measure BECSP MM4.6-3, which requires the project to comply with HBFD City Specification No. 429, Methane District Building Permit Requirement prior to issuance of a grading permit. Specifically, the Applicant would be required to submit a plan for the testing of soils for the presence of methane gas to determine if a problem exists and to rule methane out as a potential concern to the HBFD prior to commencement of sampling. In the event that methane gas is discovered, appropriate measures to reduce the potential impacts of methane gas to future occupants and visitors of the project site would be required as per City Specification No. 429 (Methane District Building Permit Requirements) and mitigation measures BECSP MM4.6-3. Implementation of mitigation measure BECSP MM4.6-3 would reduce any impacts associated with methane gas by ensuring that appropriate testing and methods of gas detection are implemented at the project site, as required by the HBFD. As such, the potential impacts associated with methane gas would be reduced to a ***less than significant*** level.

Hazardous Emissions within 0.25 Mile of an Existing or Proposed School

The project site is located 0.13 mile west of Child of Faith Preschool. Construction activities would involve the utilization of diesel-powered trucks and equipment, which would result in temporary diesel emissions that have been determined to be a health hazard. Operation of retail and residential uses of the proposed project would include the handling and/or storage of potentially hazardous materials typical of

[32] Mark E. Faulkner, Email to Rosemary Medel, Associate Planner, City of Huntington Beach, from Land Development Services LLC, regarding environmental monitoring equipment (September 2, 2011).

these uses on the project site; however, the types of hazardous materials anticipated would be limited to regulated types and quantities (i.e., household cleaners, landscaping chemicals, etc.). Compliance with existing regulations would minimize the risks associated with the exposure of sensitive receptors, including schools, to hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a ***less than significant*** impact related to the emissions or handling of hazardous materials within the vicinity of schools.

Cortese List and Other Identified Sites

According to the Phase I prepared in January 2007 by SCS, the existing gas station is a Leaking Underground Storage Tank (USTs) site with on-going remediation of soil and quarterly groundwater monitoring under the oversight of the SARWQCB and OCHCA. Subsequently, various work plans have been submitted to and approved by OCHCA to continue remediation efforts at the existing gas station. In addition, the dry cleaning facility operations used PCE on site since at least 1981. A Phase II investigation conducted in February 2008 for the dry cleaning facility determined that there were levels of PCE and TCE above the residential and industrial CHHSL. However, a no further action letter was submitted to the OCHCA on July 26, 2010 for the dry cleaner facility after a vapor extraction system successfully remediated the site to a below detectable concentration in the extracted vapor. The proposed project site is not included on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's CERCLIS database and Department of Toxic and Substances Control's EnviroStor. Based on review of the SWRCB's GeoTracker website, the proposed project site is included on the environmental databases as a LUST site, as noted in the Phase I.[33]

As required by mitigation measure BECSP MM4.6-1, and discussed above, a Phase I and Phase II were prepared for the proposed project to determine if the proposed project site has a record of hazardous material contamination and is included on a list of hazardous materials sites. Mitigation measure BECSP MM4.6-1 also required that in the event that contamination is found, the ESA would identify the nature and extent of contamination, and determine the need for further investigation and/or remediation of the soils conditions on the project site. As identified above, studies prepared for the project site, including the Phase I, Phase II, and Additional Site Assessment (Appendices B1, B2, and B3) have identified the extent of contamination and subsequently, work plans to remediate identified contamination have been submitted to and approved by OCHCA. This impact is ***less than significant***.

Safety Hazards Associated with Airports and Airstrips

The proposed project would not interfere with airport or aircraft operations as the nearest airport to the project site is the Joint Forces Training Center Los Alamitos located at least five miles to the northwest. There are no private airstrips in the nearby vicinity; however there is an existing helipad 1.47 miles north of the proposed project site on the rooftop of the sixteen-story office tower at the southwest corner of Beach Boulevard and Warner Avenue. A helipad is a designated area, including buildings or facilities, intended to be used for the landing and takeoff of helicopters. Safety issues include hazards posed to

[33] State Water Resources Control Board, GeoTracker, Beach Boulevard and Warner Avenue, Huntington Beach, CA 92647, http://geotracker.swrcb.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=beach+boulevard+and+warner+avenue%2C+huntington+beach+ca (accessed November 29, 2010).

aircraft from structures located within navigable airspace and crash hazards posed by helicopters to people and property on the ground. However, the existence of such a facility does not necessarily represent an impending impact for residents. Further, the existing helipad has not been used in over three years and the proposed project would not alter the helipad use.[34]

Implementation of the proposed project would increase the number of residents potentially exposed to helipad safety hazards. However, helipads also represent a safety feature on tall buildings in that they can be used during emergencies, such as a fire in the building. Operation of the existing helipad is required to comply with requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for Orange County, and Caltrans/Division of Aeronautics, in addition to any other local requirements. As such, this impact would be ***less than significant***.

Interfere with Emergency Response Plan or Emergency Evacuation Plan

As required by law, the proposed project would be required to provide adequate access for emergency vehicles. Additionally, development would be required to regulate the storage of flammable and explosive materials and their transport within the project site, and would comply with applicable Uniform Fire Code regulations for issues including fire protection systems and equipment, general safety precautions, and distances of structures to fire hydrants. Temporary short-term construction impacts on street traffic adjacent to the project site due to roadway and infrastructure improvements and the potential extension of construction activities into the right-of-way could result in a reduction of the number of lanes or temporary closure of segments of Beach Boulevard or Ellis Avenue. Any such impacts would be limited to the construction period of the project and would affect only adjacent streets or intersections. However, mitigation measure BECSP MM4.6-4 would ensure that emergency response teams for the City of Huntington Beach, including HBFD and Huntington Beach Police Department (HBPD) would be notified of any lane closures during construction activities on the project site and that a minimum one lane would remain open at all times to provide adequate emergency access to the site and surrounding neighborhoods. Implementation of mitigation measure BECSP MM4.6-4 would ensure that proposed development would provide adequate access for emergency vehicles, and the proposed project would result in a ***less than significant*** impact.

Wildland Fire Hazards

The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include commercial uses. No wildlands exist within the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site. Consequently, development of the proposed project would not result in an impact due to the exposure of people or structures to hazards associated with wildland fires.

Potentially significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials have been mitigated with implementation of mitigation measures BECSP MM4.6-1 through BECSP MM4.6-4 and all impacts were determined to be less than significant in this or the BECSP EIR analysis.

[34] Rosemary Medel, Written communication via email with City of Huntington Beach (April 22, 2009).

Applicable Mitigation of the BECSP EIR

BECSP MM4.6-1 *Prior to the issuance of grading permits on any project site, the site developer(s) shall:*

- *Investigate the project site to determine whether it or immediately adjacent areas have a record of hazardous material contamination via the preparation of a preliminary environmental site assessment (ESA), which shall be submitted to the City for review. If contamination is found the report shall characterize the site according to the nature and extent of contamination that is present before development activities precede at that site.*
- *If contamination is determined to be on site, the City, in accordance with appropriate regulatory agencies, shall determine the need for further investigation and/or remediation of the soils conditions on the contaminated site. If further investigation or remediation is required, it shall be the responsibility of the site developer(s) to complete such investigation and/or remediation prior to construction of the project.*
- *If remediation is required as identified by the local oversight agency, it shall be accomplished in a manner that reduces risk to below applicable standards and shall be completed prior to issuance of any occupancy permits.*
- *Closure reports or other reports acceptable to the Huntington Beach Fire Department that document the successful completion of required remediation activities, if any, for contaminated soils, in accordance with City Specification 431-92, shall be submitted and approved by the Huntington Beach Fire Department prior to the issuance of grading permits for site development. No construction shall occur in the affected area until reports have been accepted by the City.*

BECSP MM4.6-2 *In the event that previously unknown or unidentified soil and/or groundwater contamination that could present a threat to human health or the environment is encountered during construction of the proposed project, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the contamination shall cease immediately. If contamination is encountered, a Risk Management Plan shall be prepared and implemented that (1) identifies the contaminants of concern and the potential risk each contaminant would pose to human health and the environment during construction and post-development and (2) describes measures to be taken to protect workers, and the public from exposure to potential site hazards. Such measures could include a range of options, including, but not limited to, physical site controls during construction, remediation, long-term monitoring, post-development maintenance or access limitations, or some combination thereof. Depending on the nature of contamination, if any, appropriate agencies shall be notified (e.g., City of Huntington Beach Fire Department). If needed, a Site Health and Safety Plan that meets Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements shall be prepared and in place prior to commencement of work in any contaminated area.*

BECSP MM4.6-3 *Prior to the issuance of grading permits, future development in the Specific Plan shall comply with HBFD City Specification No. 429, Methane District Building Permit Requirements. A plan for the testing of soils for the presence of methane gas shall be prepared and submitted by the Applicant to the HBFD for review and approval, prior to the commencement of sampling. If methane gas is discovered in the soil on the future development project site, the Applicant's grading, building and methane plans shall reference that a sub-slab methane barrier and vent system will be installed at the project site per City Specification No. 429, prior to plan approval. If required by the HBFD, additional methane mitigation measures to reduce the level of methane gas to acceptable levels shall be implemented.*

BECSP MM4.6-4 *To ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles when construction activities would result in temporary lane or roadway closures, the developer shall consult with the City of Huntington Beach Police and*

Fire Departments to disclose temporary lane or roadway closures and alternative travel routes. The developer shall be required to keep a minimum of one lane in each direction free from encumbrances at all times on perimeter streets accessing the project site. At any time only a single lane is available, the developer shall provide a temporary traffic signal, signal carriers (i.e., flagpersons), or other appropriate traffic controls to allow travel in both directions. If construction activities require the complete closure of a roadway segment, the developer shall coordinate with the City of Huntington Beach Police and Fire Departments to designate proper detour routes and signage indicating alternative routes.

Cumulative Impacts

Project-related impacts for environmental issue areas that did not require substantial additional analysis from what was provided in the BECSP EIR are considered to be less than significant with mitigation. In addition, the proposed project would not result in impacts different from or greater than previously analyzed in the BECSP EIR. Therefore, additional cumulative impact analysis is not required for Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

4.6.4 References

County of Orange Health Care Agency, Public Health Services Environmental Health. Approval Letter for Additional Site Assessment Report Work Plan for Additional Site Assessment dated July 16, 2010, August 20, 2010.

———. Approval Letter for Revised Work Plan for Soil Vapor Survey dated November 30, 2010, January 12, 2011.

———. Approval Letter for Work Plan for Additional Site Assessment dated December 15, 2010, January 13, 2011.

———. Approval Letter for Work Plan for SPH removal- MW-11 dated November 29, 2010, January 11, 2011.

Faulkner, Mark E. Email to Rosemary Medel, Associate Planner, City of Huntington Beach, from Land Development Services LLC, regarding environmental monitoring equipment, September 2, 2011.

Huntington Beach, City of. *Beach and Edinger Corridors Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report*, November 2009.

———. *City of Huntington Beach General Plan*, May 13, 1996.

SCS Engineers (SCS). *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, Shell Station and Town Country Plaza, 18502 and 18510 to 18552 Beach Boulevard, Huntington Beach, CA 92648*, January 22, 2007.

———. *Phase II Investigation Report, Ellis Cleaners, 18510 Beach Boulevard, Huntington Beach, CA 92648*, February 2, 2008.

———. "No Further Action" Letter, Ellis Cleaners, 18510 Beach Boulevard, Huntington Beach (OCHCA Case 08IC012), October 14, 2010.

Wayne Perry, Inc. *Additional Site Assessment Report and Work Plan for Additional Site Assessment, Shell Service Station, 18502 Beach Boulevard (at Ellis Avenue), Huntington Beach, California*, July 16, 2010.

———.*Revised Work Plan for Soil Vapor Survey, Shell Service Station, 18502 Beach Boulevard (at Ellis Avenue), Huntington Beach, California*, November 30, 2010.

———.*Work Plan for Additional Site Assessment, Shell Service Station, 18502 Beach Boulevard (at Ellis Avenue), Huntington Beach, California*, December 15, 2010.

———.*Work Plan for SPH Removal-MW-11, Shell-Branded Service Station, 18502 Beach Boulevard (at Ellis Avenue), Huntington Beach, California*, November 29, 2010.